Case 2:13-cr-00622-JDW Document 194 Filed 12/04/20 Page 1 of 70

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 13-CR-622-1 VS. Philadelphia, PA JEREL JACKSON, September 10, 2019 Defendant. 3:10 p.m.

> TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE C. DARNELL JONES, II UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: MICHELLE L. MORGAN, ESQUIRE

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

615 Chestnut Street

Suite 1250

Philadelphia, PA 19106-4476

For the Defendant: MARK T. WILSON, ESQUIRE

> FEDERAL COMMUNITY DEFENDERS OFFICE Eastern District of Pennsylvania

601 Walnut Street

Suite 540-W

Philadelphia, PA 19106

Audio Operator: A'iSHAH EL-SHABAZZ

Transcribed by: DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING, LLC

P.O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026-0129

Office: (856) 435-7172 Fax: (856) 435-7124
Email: dianadoman@comcast.net

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2		
3	SUMMARY OF THE CASE:	PAGE
4	By Judge Jones	5
5		
6	<u>ARGUMENT</u> :	PAGE
7	Re: Objections to Presentence Report	
8	By Mr. Wilson	8, 12, 14
9	By Ms. Morgan	9, 13
10	Re: Sentencing	
11	By Mr. Wilson	20
12		
13	<u>WITNESS STATEMENT</u> :	PAGE
14	By Ms. DeVaughn	18
15		
16	STATEMENT OF THE DEFENDANT:	PAGE
17	By Jerel Jackson	25
18		
19	SENTENCE OF THE COURT:	PAGE
20	By Judge Jones	30
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Colloquy

1 (The following was heard in open court at 3:10 p.m.) THE COURT: This is the resentencing in the matter 2 3 of the United States of America versus Jerel Jackson, a/k/a 4 "Jinx", Criminal Number 13-622. Counsel, would you identify yourselves for the 5 record, please? 6 7 MS. MORGAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michelle Morgan for the United States and with me at counsel table is 8 Glenn Booth, Special Agent from the FBI. 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon to you both. 10 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, Mark Wilson for the Federal 11 Defenders on behalf of Mr. Jerel Jackson. 12 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon -- excuse me. And good 14 afternoon, Mr. Jackson. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. THE COURT: Ma'am, would you identify yourself for 16 17 the record, please. 18 MS. SANTELLA: Talia Santella for the U.S. Probation 19 Office on behalf of Leslie Maxwell. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. I would ask that the oath be administered to those who will testify. 21 22 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Mr. Jackson, will you stand for me, please. Can you raise your right hand. 23 JEREL JACKSON, DEFENDANT, SWORN 24

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you, sir. You may be

25

1 seated.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Ms. Santella, could you stand, please. Raise your right hand.

TALIA SANTELLA, PROBATION OFFICER, SWORN

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. You may be seated.

THE COURT: For the record, on February 5th of 2015, a Federal Grand Jury seated in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, returned a five-count second superseding indictment charging the defendant, Jerel Jackson, with sex trafficking of a minor or by force in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Sections 1591 and 1594(a), that being Counts 1 through 5; and sex trafficking by force in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Sections 1591 and 1594(a), Counts 2, 3 and 4.

On March 18th of 2015, the defendant appeared before this Court at which time he entered an open plea of guilty to Counts 1 through 5 of the second superseding indictment.

On June 2nd of 2016, Mr. Jackson was sentenced by this Court after a lengthy sentencing hearing. This Court in imposing sentence took into consideration all factors required in fashioning an appropriate sentence consistent with the relevant statutory sentencing scheme, including Section 3553(a) factors, the United States Sentencing Guidelines, sentencing memoranda of counsel and all statements of record

The Court - Summary of the Case including the allocution statement of the defendant.

At the conclusion of the sentencing hearing, this Court imposed a sentence as follows:

Count 1, 180 months incarceration; Counts 2, 3 and 4, 180 months incarceration to run concurrently, one with the other, and concurrently with the sentence imposed on Count 1; Count 5, 180 months incarceration to run consecutively to the sentence imposed on Counts 1 through 4 for a total period of 360 months or 30 years incarceration.

Now, regarding the Sentencing Guidelines calculations, the United States Probation Department and this Court originally determined that the offenses did not group and calculated the adjusted offense level for each count and determined a total of four units would be added to the highest adjusted offense level of 42.

This resulted in a total offense level of 43 and at the applicable Criminal History Category of V, a Guideline range of life in prison was appropriate -- appropriate in the sense that that was what was reflected in the United States Sentencing Guideline schematic.

At sentencing on June 1st of 2016, this Court sustained certain objections to some of the enhancements in the individual groups which lowered the highest adjusted offense level to 40. This resulted in the assessment of one unit for each group for a total of five units, and Section

The Court - Summary of the Case

3D1.4 of the Guidelines directed where a multiple-count adjustment generates a total of five units, four levels are added to the highest offense level. The Court instead applied a five-level increase which resulted in a total offense level of 43 and a Guideline range of life. The Court, for the record, did not impose a sentence of life in prison.

As was Mr. Jackson's right, he filed an appeal of this Court's decisions. In a decision of the Court of Appeals in October of 2017, it was ordered that this Court resentence Mr. Jackson because the Appellate Court agreed with Mr. Jackson in pertinent part as follows:

"That his sentencing range was erroneously calculated in applying United States Sentencing Guideline, Section 3D1.4 to obtain the combined offense level. Here, although the District Court correctly determined that five units were present, it incorrectly increased the combined level offense adjust to five levels rather than the proper four levels. The Government concedes that Mr. Jackson's Guideline range was erroneously calculated and that this miscalculation affected his substantial rights."

The Court opinion goes on to state, "Accordingly, we will vacate the sentence and will remand the case to the District Court for resentencing."

Within that, they cite, "<u>United States vs. Mateo-</u>
<u>Medina</u>," and state, "We generally vacate a procedurally

The Court - Summary of the Case deficient sentence and remand for resentencing."

Now, this Court, meaning me, acknowledge -- and I humbly acknowledge my error consistent with the findings of the Court of Appeals. Therefore, acknowledging the correct four-level increase, the total offense level was 42, not 43. The defendant's Guideline range, therefore, is 360 months to life in prison. So, essentially, the numbers were never

affected. It was procedurally deficient and nothing more.

The instant offense occurred from November 12th -2012, excuse me -- through October of 2013. Therefore, both
the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and the Anti-Terrorism and
Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 apply, including the
Mandatory Victims Restitution Act of 1996.

As there are no ex post facto issues, the addition of the Sentencing Guidelines Manual used to calculate the Guidelines in the report, is that incorporating amendments effective through November 1st of 2014, is that correct, or '16?

MS. MORGAN: 2014.

THE COURT: All right. There is a Presentence
Investigation Report which was prepared by Senior United
States Probation Officer, Ms. Leslie Maxwell, on June 10th of
2015, and revised on June 24th of 2015.

Mr. Wilson, have you discussed that report with your client?

MR. WILSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Jackson, have you read the report or was it read to you, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: We was waiting on the revised report, so we -- yes, the one from 2015, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, are there any objections to the Presentence Report?

MR. WILSON: There are, Your Honor, objections that I submitted December 28, 2018, by letter, I think it was addressed to Your Honor and copied to the Government and Ms. Maxwell, in which I raised certain objections to the version of the report that's dated June 24, 2015.

I noted first in that letter that it was my understanding that Your Honor had previously ruled at the initial sentencing on June 2nd of 2016, that a defense objection to the application of two enhancements in the June 24, 2015, report be sustained. The report has not been changed to reflect that.

However, with those enhancements removed, and those would be the enhancements in paragraphs 28 and 54, with those enhancements removed, the adjusted offense levels in paragraph 34 and in paragraph -- and I think I put 56 and I meant 59 -- would be reduced to 38 and 40 respectively. And I think Your Honor based your calculation of the Guidelines the last time based on those, but just so it's clear, I am renewing that

objection that was sustained previously and has not -- there has been no amended report as of yet.

Your Honor, I also objected to the two-level enhancements in paragraphs 34, 42 and 48, and they're all related to the same particular enhancement. And I -- I apologize, 34 is incorrect. It should be in paragraphs -- I'm trying to think of what report -- there are enhancements on three of the counts, Your Honor, with respect to 2G1.3(b)(4).

MS. MORGAN: 36, 42 and 48.

MR. WILSON: Yes, 36, 42 and 48.

THE COURT: Counsel, I think we might simplify this somewhat if I allow counsel for the Government to address these, because as I recall, the Government agreed to certain modifications proposed by the defendant, and we might be able to address that without any further complication.

MR. WILSON: If that's the case, Your Honor, I would defer.

MS. MORGAN: Your Honor, there was some agreement as to certain enhancements not applying to certain groups. The Court did rule at the last hearing that the obstruction enhancement did apply to certain groups, and the Government asserts the same reasons in this hearing, that it should continue to apply.

If we look at the groups individually, it is the Government's position with respect to Group 1 which relates to

1 Person 1, that the defense is correct that the two-point enhancement for custody and control does not apply, and the 2 resultant offense level for that group is 38. 3 4 With respect to Person 2, Group 2, I believe the parties are in agreement that 36 is the appropriate level. 5 THE COURT: Now, do you agree with that, Mr. Wilson? 6 7 Because I had originally listed that as 34. MR. WILSON: I believe that should be 34, Your 8 Honor, because I believe the enhancement in paragraph 42, that 9 the offense involved the commission of a sex act pursuant to 10 2G1.3(b)(4) should not apply because the individual in that 11 case was not a minor. 12 13 MS. MORGAN: That's correct, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Group 3? 15 MR. WILSON: So that -- that should be 34 in 16 paragraph 46. 17 MS. MORGAN: So it should be 34 for Group 2, Your 18 With regard to Group 3, we have the same issue. 19 enhancement should not apply, so the ultimate level should be 20 34. With regard to Group 4, the same issue, the two-21 point enhancement for commission of a sex act should not 22 23 apply.

And so that group would be a 36. And Group 5, without the custody and control enhancement, that group is 40.

24

25

So what that means, Your Honor, is that Group 1 gets

one unit; Group 2 gets a half unit; Group 3 gets a half unit; Group 4 gets one unit, and Group 5 gets one unit for a total of four units, which means adding to the highest offense level of 40 results, with a plus-four of 44, minus two for acceptance of responsibility yields an ultimate total offense level of 42.

THE COURT: Counsel, that's what I have as well, exactly that. Do you disagree, Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WILSON: I do renew, Your Honor, the objections as I did in my letter of December 28th, 2018, I renew the objections to the application of the obstruction of justice enhancements that Ms. Morgan had just talked about, and those are with respect to Count 4 and Count 5 or Group 4 and Group 5 as they were referred to.

If those enhancements were removed, the total offense level would drop down to 40 rather than 42.

MS. MORGAN: I would note, Your Honor, I maintain the position that the obstruction enhancement applies. Your Honor will recall that in the pretrial motions hearing, Your Honor heard recordings from the FDC of the defendant contacting Victims 4 and 5 in this case --

THE COURT: Which is why I originally overruled the objection that was made.

Wilson - Argument 1 MS. MORGAN: Correct. So the Government maintains its position that the obstruction enhancement applies. 2 However, even if it were not to apply, the Guideline range is 3 4 still 360 months to life. THE COURT: Indeed. Nevertheless, the Court does 5 believe it applies, counsel, so the objection is overruled. 6 7 MR. WILSON: And not -- I raise those for the -- for the record, Your Honor. 8

THE COURT: Surely.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, the last issue that I had objected to that I don't think has been ruled on, because I think Your Honor had indicated previously that you were taking into account that he had gotten a GED at -- at St. Gabe's, and -- but there is an issue with respect to paragraph 77 of the report prepared on June 24th of 2015.

It indicates in that -- in the report that the conviction was for carrying a firearm without a license and institutional vandalism. It shows a Municipal Court number. It says that the arrest was November 19th of 2011, but it shows a Municipal Court number that has a 2006 date on it. However, when you plug in to the computer, the 49-246-2011 number, it's a case actually involving an arrest for possession of marijuana for which there was a guilty plea with no penalty.

And if there's no penalty, then there's no sentence

for which a point should be awarded. And if no point is awarded, his total point level drops down to nine, not ten, and would put him at Criminal History Category IV and not Criminal History Category V.

THE COURT: And the Guideline range, assuming that that was accurate, would be still 360 months to life, correct?

MR. WILSON: It -- it would not change the Guideline range, Your Honor. It is significant for purposes of determination of his security level at the -- within the Bureau of Prisons. And it's also -- it should be -- he doesn't have an additional conviction for a firearm. It was for possession of marijuana.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the Government on that one.

MS. MORGAN: Your Honor, as indicated in the Government's letter of January 4th, 2019, to the Court, it is not accurate to say that the Guidelines award no points. It is accurate to say that the Guidelines do not address the issue of a conviction without a penalty, because such an outcome I would suggest to the Court seems highly unlikely, and I'm not sure what the documentation is to support that actual outcome.

But in any event, what the Guidelines do speak to in Application Note 3 to Section 4A1.1 as well as Section 4A1.2(f), is that a diversionary disposition, in other words,

resulting in no actual term of incarceration or probation, is counted where it results from a conviction.

And in light of the fact that a diversionary disposition would result in a point being awarded, the Government submits that a conviction with "no penalty" should also result in a point being awarded, because it's essentially the same outcome. And the Court is correct that even if the defendant has nine points rather than ten, the Guideline range remains 360 to life.

THE COURT: All right. And the Court understands
Mr. Wilson's position regarding at least potentially --

MR. WILSON: It has potential consequences down the line, Your Honor, with respect to his security level calculation.

Your Honor, I can hand up a -- Your Honor, I just hand up a copy of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania Court summary. I've highlighted it by --

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: -- the conviction at issue. And I'd like to note I believe the error in paragraph 77 is that the presentence investigator looked up the conviction under the Case Number 49-246-2006. I did the same and found out that it -- it is for a -- somebody else's conviction. It is for carrying a firearm. It is not the conviction of the arrest of 2011.

1 THE COURT: Was not this Judge a Municipal Court Judge? 2 3 MR. WILSON: The Judge who --4 THE COURT: Segal (phonetic). MR. WILSON: Yes, Your Honor. And as you see on 5 6 there, it's an MC number. 7 THE COURT: Yes, it's an MC number, a Municipal Court number and not a Common Pleas Court number. 8 MR. WILSON: And in 2011 carrying a firearm was 9 considered a felony not a misdemeanor anymore. 10 11 THE COURT: Surely. All right. Counsel, I'll accept that modification. Again, in terms of the Sentencing 12 13 Guidelines, it does not affect it. So that the --14 MR. WILSON: My point with respect to the no further 15 penalty, Your Honor, I don't know whether -- the Guidelines Criminal History calculations are based on sentences, not 16 17 convictions, and there is no indication as to how a conviction 18 with no further penalty should be treated under the 19 Guidelines, whether it should be given points or not. And I'd 20 say since the Guidelines don't mention that, that no points should be given. It's not a sentence. 21 THE COURT: If the Court does not give it a point --22 MR. WILSON: It does not change the Guidelines. 23 Ιt 24 does lower his Criminal History Category from a V to a IV.

THE COURT: All right. I will accept that

25

Wilson - Argument 1 modification, and it will be lowered from V to IV. counsel, that is 42, IV? 2 MR. WILSON: That's -- that's correct, Your Honor, 3 4 based on the Court's current rulings. And, Your Honor, I would want to make it clear that 5 it is, as an adult, that that -- that listed conviction in 6 7 2011 is not for carrying a qun, but it is for possession of marijuana. 8 THE COURT: Well, that's what the sheet --9 MR. WILSON: I would ask that that be changed also 10 11 with -- yes. THE COURT: -- that's what the sheet says. So --12 MR. WILSON: And if -- Your Honor, if I can take 13 14 that back, I'll give it to Ms. Santella so that --15 THE COURT: That's just fine and so ordered. MR. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor. I think that's 16 17 -- those were the extent of the objections I had to the June 18 24th, 2015, report. 19 THE COURT: Very well. All right. Having throughly 20 of fact and conclusions set forth in pages one through 25 of 21 22

reviewed the report, the Court adopts as its own, the findings same with the exception of the adjustments made based upon the Court's rulings on the objections lodged in this record.

Now, although the Sentencing Guidelines are no longer mandatory, I recognize that I must consider them with

23

24

25

all other factors in fashioning an appropriate sentence consistent with Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 18 -- excuse me -- Title 18, Section 3553(a).

Accordingly, I must determine what the applicable or arguably applicable Guideline range is, and I must consider the policy statements included within those Guidelines, and having done so, I must determine the facts appropriate for imposing a reasonable sentence in this matter.

And this is true whether or not there have been objections made to the report, and that, counsel, under the circumstances, the Court would procedurally allow for any additional argument that needs to be made as well as any witnesses who would appear on behalf of either the Government or the defendant or the defendant's own allocution right.

MS. MORGAN: I don't have any witnesses, Your Honor.

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, there are several people, obviously, who have turned up for -- on behalf of Mr. Jackson and I have indicated to them that they each have the opportunity if they wish to come up and speak to Your Honor at the podium, and I just defer to whoever wants to come up now, just come up one at a time. You can just approach the podium on that side of the table.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good afternoon, ma'am.

MS. DeVAUGHN: Good afternoon.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: I'm going to ask you to state

THE WITNESS: I want to thank you for just allowing us to come back before you. I know that Jerel has done things and he has consequences for his actions. However, I just wanted to let you know that he is not the person that appears on that paper, all of -- all of it.

21

22

23

24

25

So I'm just asking you to please have some leniency.

Statement of Ms. DeVaughn

I know you're going by your Guidelines. I was listening very carefully, but I'm just asking you to have some leniency, because that is my son and I love him and I would love to see him back in his family at some point in his life and my life.

anything that he may have done, but it's so difficult for me
-- it's so difficult for me. He's my only son and I just love
him and I want him to do the right thing. Always I have -but I have -- I raised him by myself. And, again, we don't
come from a bad family. He made some bad mistakes, but he has
a lot of support, and we're all willing to -- we want to help
him do better and do the right thing.

And I don't understand all of this legal stuff, but
I just know that I miss my son and I can't see him and it
hurts really bad. I just don't know what else to do. I just
-- I just beg for your mercy to please have mercy on my family
because we miss him a lot.

And even being down here in Center City, they -something went on at the -- at the prison, and I haven't seen
my son since May 11th when my aunt passed away, and I went to
see him and he was, you know, in the SHU for whatever reason,
I don't know.

But they have not let me see my son since. I haven't hugged my son, touched my son or anything. So it's --

it's so hard for me because when he finished being sentenced, they want to send him away far, so I'm still not going to see him. And I've written letters and did everything that I possibly could do and I'm still not getting any results.

So I'm just asking you to just consider whatever you can consider to help me and my family and his daughter. I didn't bring her because I didn't want her to hear any of this or see her dad like that, but she's 13 and she needs him, too.

That's all. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: For the record, the Court has received communications in writing from Natia or Natia L. Brown (phonetic), Samira Martin (phonetic), John and Rene Brown, Rosetta Meares (phonetic) and Edward H. Louis. These letters will be incorporated into today's record. I will not read them onto the record, but they will be incorporated into the record and made a part of the record.

In pertinent part, each one speaks to supporting Mr. Jackson, their history with Mr. Jackson and their request for leniency and understanding in sentencing of Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I sent a sentencing memorandum, a short sentencing memorandum some time ago. One of the things that I

did not mention in the sentencing memorandum, and I would start off with is, some things have changed since my client appeared before you last aside from the reframing of the Sentencing Guidelines, the applicable Sentencing Guideline range.

My client has been actively involved in classes while in custody, and the Supreme Court has recognized that Your Honor can consider post-offense rehabilitation. It's -- it's hard when you're in prison, especially when you're in detention as opposed to being in prison as a sentenced inmate, and he's been in detention essentially since the -- since he was sent back here as a result of the Third Circuit decision.

I hand up to the Court a print-out of the classes that he's taken while he's here, and -- and I find it somewhat remarkable simply because I do have clients who tell me, oh, there's no classes available to detainees over at the Federal Detention Center and yet my client has managed to find a number of classes that -- and completed those classes.

Most involve -- I think about seven or eight of them there involve efforts to qualify for a CDL license and he has indeed qualified for a CDL license while he's been in custody. He also has taken the first level of Spanish courses and completed that to try and learn Spanish as a second language.

He has not been sitting around doing nothing while he's in custody and I would ask the Court to take note of

that, that he is somebody who's interested in improving himself in making up for the educational deficits that he had as a youth.

And the -- the report really mentions very little about his education other than that at one point he was sent to St. Gabe's as a juvenile, and while at St. Gabe's, as Your Honor has found, he earned a GED there.

So when he went to school, when he had structure, he -- he did fairly well. He certainly did better than he was doing when he didn't have the structure, and this is a man who grew up without much structure in his life other than the time that he was at St. Gabe's. He has -- and so those are all characteristics that the Court can take into account and what he's done since.

There is a need for punishment. Obviously, 3553(a) speaks to that. There's a need for creation of respect for the law, and there's a need for deterrence of others, deterrence of Mr. Jackson. I would suggest and I recognize that this was suggested to Your Honor in the prior sentencing, but 15 years mandatory in this case -- or the mandatory in each of the -- on a couple of the counts -- is an extensive period of time for -- especially somebody who is in his thirties.

It's an amount of time that would allow him to continue to improve himself, to give himself employable skills

when he gets out. And I recognize that he had no history of employment coming in. It -- it allows him to reflect on what he has done wrong. It takes him away from society for a substantial period of time.

It doesn't appear that there is any need to sentence him beyond that 15 years other than punishment for the seriousness of the offenses. And I would challenge that it's even necessary to go beyond the 15 years for that in this case.

One of the things that my client will tell you is that he has been cooperating with Klein and Specter. He was contacted by one attorney from there, and he's been cooperating with them in a lawsuit that they have for women who were child victims. They're suing the hotel or the motel up on Roosevelt Boulevard where much of this activity has occurred, and my client has been cooperating with them in their representing the plaintiff victims in that case. He is somebody who is seriously interested in turning his life around.

Even a sentence of 30 years, he will very likely get out some day, that he -- that he will be in his fifties when he completes a 30-year sentence. And so the question is what -- what does society need in terms of punishment from him that would cause him to be released in his thirties rather than his -- in his fifties rather than his forties when he would not

have been so far away from society that he can't become a contributing member?

It's much, much harder for a man in his late fifties to get a job than it is for a man in his forties to -- to get a job. I would just suggest that that's a factor that needs to be considered in what is the amount of time that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the goals of sentencing in this case.

He is -- he is trying -- he has demonstrated so far that he is trying to change his life. He recognizes that he must be punished. He recognized that he was pleading guilty, when he was pleading guilty, that Your Honor had to sentence him to 15 years and so he was pleading guilty to a lot of time.

And he is trying to do things to -- to make things better, not just for the -- for himself and for his family, but also for the people who were victimized in his activity and others who were operating in a similar fashion to him.

For all of those reasons, I would suggest a sentence well below the 30 years that was previously imposed, and I -- you know, I respect Your Honor's view on all this, but I would suggest that 15 years is a lot of time, and it -- and it could easily be characterized as sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the goals of sentencing in this case.

Thank you.

1 THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Jackson, you have a right of allocution. If you wish to say anything to me, you can at this time, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: All right. Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I'm back before you to be sentenced once again. This time around is much different for me. I've grown in so many ways and experienced so many different things over the past few years.

I learned a lot about myself and others and how to appreciate the people in my life who truly cares about me. It took a long time, but at this point in my life I'm just learning how to live all over again, because, clearly, the way I was living before was incorrect.

If you could remember, the last time I was in here, my family and friends packed this courtroom for about two days straight. Today a lot of those people are no longer in my life. I lost a lot of people to the test of time. Some of these people has even died and I'll never get to spend time with them again. But I lost a lot of experience as far as my relationships with my friends and family.

Most of all, I lost myself emotionally and mentally.

I'm not the same person. And, of course, it's not a totally

bad thing, sometimes -- but sometimes it's hard to acknowledge

all the good I've done as well when it feels like I'm just doomed from life for what seems like forever. But a lot of that change has to do with my new growth and a lot of that has to do with the time I was given.

I act strong of body, but honestly, emotionally and mentally, it broke me, it broke my spirit, all because of some bad decisions I made and now I'm the one that has to live with this pain. To make up for my sins, though, I try to help people in many ways that I can. I try to encourage the younger people to live better and not feed into the hype of the so-called easy route because it pays off in hard time and the price isn't worth it.

I can't change my past, and I am truly ashamed for ever contributing and to hurting anyone because now I just try to live in peace. But like I said before, I'm so far removed from the person that I once was that I barely recognize myself in the mirror.

You told me at my last sentencing that you can kill the spirit of a person and they can still walk this earth. No disrespect, Your Honor, but that's what I felt like you did to me when you sentenced me to 30 years. It didn't hit me right away, but when I got places and saw how bad it was, how miserable and dangerous it was, how groups of people would literally go to war with each other over the tiniest things that don't even matter is when it hit me.

Now, and that mixed with losing my friends and family, you know, it just killed me. I realized that this is my reality, and there's a strong possibility that I might not make it home. I could be hurt or even be forced to hurt someone else just to save my own life. And that reality is psychologically disturbing. It haunts me -- not a dream but my reality.

It's programs in the prison, but there is no true rehabilitation in these places and it's sad for those of us who really want help, want to practice integrity, so we can get out, be productive, live right, show the growth for the people that doubted us as well as prove it to ourselves. But, unfortunately, these places either make your heart cold -- colder or they drive you crazy.

If I do 20 more years of this, I don't know what -what I might do -- I mean, what I might do when I get home. I
be like a war vet or something with PTSD. It's designed for
me to fail, and that's only if I make it home with my sanity
and/or my health. The rehabilitation is within the person not
the prison, and I can honestly say that I'm striving to do
better.

Yes, sometimes things happen in jail and I periodically slip up, but my goal is to wake up every day a better person than I was yesterday. It takes -- it's hard work and an earnest effort. Now, I understand -- now, I

understand I did not, you know, assist the law enforcement in any way and I can't get less than my mandatory minimum of 15 years.

But I did tell my story to the civil lawyer from

Klein and Specter that my lawyer -- Mr. Wilson was talking

about who represents young women who were allegedly

prostituted as minors in the civil suit against the Days Inn,

Roosevelt and different hotels including but not limited to at

least one of the victims on my case. I figure financial

compensation for my victim and all the other victims that the

lawyer represents is a start.

And the hotels, he goes out there, loses their money and gets shut down, and that's another step in the right direction of stopping prostitution in places that enables you with children to work as prostitutes. I'm already doing my time and now I'm just trying to do my part.

I will hope you consider my effort when making your decision. Your Honor, I'm already doing better mentally. I want to come home some time in the near future or whenever so I can prove that I can do better for real. I been programming and I received all my hours and a certificate for my CDL, so I will be able to seek employment in that field upon my release.

And, of course, I'll keep trying to better myself day by day. I ask that you allow consecutive terms of 15 years to run concurrent with the others. I feel like that

Statement of the Defendant

still would protect the integrity of the public, set the standard, 15 years is a long time and that will deter people from wanting to, you know, be involved in this field of prostitution and things like that.

Again, I assure you that I'm done living a life of crime. This isn't for me anymore. When you last departed from my life sentence Guidelines, you gave me 30 years, and I appreciate that, because if not for that time, I'm not sure if I would have grown up so quickly and I really probably wouldn't have had to -- if I didn't have to feel that pain, I'm not sure I would have been thinking the same way I think today, and I'll -- I'll be, you know, moving in my life. So I thank you for that.

I know life is precious and I would like to share some of my youth with my children and the rest of my family again. So once again, I just ask that you depart from the Guidelines and consider running the sentences concurrent which would bring me to my mandatory minimum.

And I also ask for your recommendation to be transferred to FCI Fairton due to the sensitive nature of my case. Plus there's additional programs there that I want to take, and that's the closest yard with these programs in this region. That recommendation would go a long way and be very helpful in my rehabilitation.

Thank you, Your Honor. I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Again, for the record -- and thank you very much -- Counts 1 through 5, each carry a mandatory minimum term of incarceration of 15 years and a maximum term of life in prison, a five-year minimum period of supervised release, a maximum term of lifetime of supervised release, a maximum \$250,000 fine and a mandatory \$100 special assessment per count.

The total sentence is a mandatory minimum of 15 years in prison or 75 years if run consecutively, a maximum of life in prison, a five-year minimum period of supervised release, a lifetime term of supervised release, a maximum of \$1,250,000 fine and a \$500 special assessment.

The Court will now readdress the considerations which the Court is required to do pursuant to Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 3553(a). I refer to the advisory Sentencing Guidelines which are a major factor that the Court must consider in fashioning an otherwise discretionary sentence.

Section 3553(a) directs that the Court, in determining the particular sentence to be imposed, shall also consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense, the need to afford adequate deterrence to

criminal conduct and to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, the need to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

I must consider the Guidelines and policy statements issued by the United States Sentencing Commission as well as the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct.

And I pause here because I reflect back on another defendant in another case who I, for the same charges with somewhat different circumstances, imposed a sentence of 100 years in prison. Restitution is not an issue in this case.

I have painstakingly reviewed all of the relevant sentencing factors contained in the Presentence Investigation Report, the memoranda submitted by both defense counsel and counsel for the Government, the defendant's statements of allocution as well as the statements of his mother this afternoon which I appreciate and all of the letters that were written to the Court in support of the defendant.

The Court notes that Mr. Jackson is before it to be resentenced for serious and frankly outrageous criminal conduct toward various females, some juveniles. This matter involves at the time a 29-year-old defendant who incurred seven adult convictions including the conviction for this

offense. His prior offenses involved distribution of controlled substances, drugs, carrying a firearm without a license and various theft offenses.

The Court does note that Mr. Jackson's first arrest occurred at age 14. This resulted in a juvenile adjudication with a placement outside of his home. He had five additional juvenile adjudications which included placement in various juvenile institutions including St. Gabriel's Hall, the Abraxas Foundation and the Youth Detention Center at Danville, Pennsylvania.

I am intricately familiar with all of those as I was a Public Defender and Chief of the Family Court Division for the Public Defender's Office for many years. I know all of these institutions and I know why children are sent to these institutions, particularly Danville.

The record has reflected that Mr. Jackson has no verifiable employment history. However, he has no mental health issues which need to be addressed while incarcerated, and the Court is sensitive to what Mr. Jackson has articulated in terms of the wear and tear frankly emotionally on anyone who's incarcerated. I note that the record indicates that he has a history of substance abuse which should be treated while incarcerated.

The Court has never and will never pass moral judgment. I say that as a preface to the following sentence

because this is simply a part of the record, and that is, the defendant has fathered two children with two women and has not consistently participated in their rearing but understandably so.

I do not know whether or not the defendant has in any way financially supported these children, whether he was not in custody or in custody. I note that I had a defendant appear before me not too long ago who put away virtually everything he made while in prison and had a substantial sentence and sent it to his children.

In this case, the defendant's conduct in these cases is most disturbing. It was violent and merited the sentence that the Court considered initially. The best that this Court can surmise from looking at this defendant's record prior to his articulation today about his change in life, at no time in his adult life had he made an effort to conduct himself in a law-abiding manner.

The pre-eminent concern pursuant to Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 3553(a)(2)(C) is for the Court to consider the protection of the public and the punishment of Mr. Jackson. As I stated at the original sentencing in this case, the need for incarceration in this matter is increased when considering the nature of the offense, the degree of harm and the conduct with respect to the counts of conviction.

I'm now tasked with fashioning a sentence that must

take into account all of the factors that I've just referenced, but I must also take into account the content of counsel's argument for the defendant in terms of his current situation and his accomplishments to date while incarcerated, and I say accomplishments, because they are an indication that you've done a lot to change in the limited fashion and the limited manner that you had an opportunity to do so.

A significant sentence well in excess of the seriousness that portends in this case was considered by the Court which initially was to give consecutive sentences for all of these counts. The Court gives the defendant the benefit of a more humane treatment than he gave his victims. However, a sentence of a significant period of incarceration is justified.

I have weighed the following: The arguments of the Government that, "The depravity of the crimes in the instant case cannot be overstated. Jerel Jackson directed atrocious physical abuse toward his victims, demonstrating the hazard he presents to society. The defendant frequently resorted to violence if he believed that any of the females withheld money or were reluctant to work. To verify that the young women gave all their earnings to him, he would make them strip down, squat and cough for internal inspection, sometimes even manually searching their vaginas for money.

"The defendant had a belligerent and explosive

temper which frequently resulted in him punching, slapping, choking and kicking the victims. To mandate compliance with his rules, the defendant on several occasions threatened victims with a gun and used a taser weapon on some young women and he once burned a victim on the face with a hair straightening iron.

"Mr. Jackson numbed the victims to their tragic consequences and circumstances by plying them with PCP, marijuana and prescription pain killers. He also required them to have sex with him and impregnated one of the victims.

"His egregious disregard for these women stepped beyond mere pimping for quick cash, repugnant in and of itself, but into the realm of the insidious and frivolous abuse of vulnerable women and girls, forcefully prostituting, beating, drugging and coercing three young women and two girls to have sex with numerous men requires a unique form of maliciousness. So, too, does burning someone with an iron as punishment, using a taser weapon on another person as a form of torture or impregnating a 16-year-old girl.

"The defendant's particular brand of cruelty has indelibly scarred his victims mentally, emotionally and in some cases physically. His volatile nature and aggressive behavior forced these victims to live in a state of fear and they suffered irreparable damage to their psychological and emotional well-being by having sex with numerous strangers

under duress. Undoubtedly, the traumatic time with the defendant left their self-worth and dignity in tatters and will encumber their psyches for the rest of their lives.

"As for the history and characteristics of the defendant, simply put, Mr. Jackson has been a poster child for recidivism. At 29 at the time of the initial sentencing, he had never held a legitimate job and relied on a violent life of crime to finance his existence."

The Court does not punish Mr. Jackson for the things that he was arrested for or did in his preteen years. The Court is acutely aware of the circumstances in which he grew up, but, nevertheless, there are so many people who have said they grew up in the same circumstances, but they knew right from wrong. Fatherless or motherless or friendless, they knew right from wrong.

The Court is cognizant of the arguments of his counsel, essentially, that there is little extrajudicial history that appears in the records beyond the criminality of his youth. His counsel has argued that he started life as the only child of a 16-year-old mother and an incarcerated father and that he did not meet his father until his father was released from prison when Jerel was 17 years of age. He has described him -- yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, that's wrong.

THE COURT: What's wrong?

Sentence of the Court 1 THE DEFENDANT: That part right there. I been with my Dad since I was a kid. My Mom was 17 when she had me. 2 That's wrong. The employment history is wrong. I had 3 4 multiple jobs. THE COURT: I will give you the time right now to 5 tell me -- tell me exactly where I was wrong, and I want you 6 7 to do that.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I have no problems with that.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Yes, sir, go right ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I -- I worked at multiple I started working when I was a kid. I worked for my uncle, he right there. He had a store in the Reading Terminal. I worked for him when I was a kid. I worked at Northeast Glass and Windows. I had plenty of jobs. at Blockbuster. I told Ms. -- Maxine that I had plenty of jobs and she wrote whatever she wanted to write. I told them I had jobs.

A lot of the stuff that we talking about that's -- I don't know, it supposed to be statement of facts. As far as me doing things to these girls, that is not true, and I'm offended that you be keep repeating the same stuff. It's hurtful that they gotta stand here and hear the stuff that I know I didn't do.

Like, I -- and I said that in my last hearing. I said I'm guilty of some of the things on some of the charges. Like, I admitted to some things, but I pled -- but we understood why I pled. I said I was guilty for some things, but I never burnt anyone. I never used a taser against anyone. I didn't sedate nobody to do none of this crazy stuff.

You're judging me on what you was just reading.

That sounds like a horrible person. I did none of that.

Like, you know what I mean, I was involved in the prostitution, I admitted that, but I was -- I was part of that. But I didn't physically abuse none of those girls like I said I did -- like I said I did not last time in the same courtroom at sentencing. I said that last time.

There's just certain things I wouldn't do to women. I was raised by women. You know, I got a daughter, and I'm not going to do certain things to females as -- or not even males that can't do something to stop. Like, I wouldn't take advantage of a man that couldn't do nothing about it. Like, I wouldn't do things like that.

All right. So everything that they saying and as far as the prosecution saying that I did, as far as that, I didn't -- like, I'm not going to say everything that she saying is not -- is not true. But it's -- it's not true what she was saying about me -- I wouldn't -- I didn't burn anyone,

I didn't tase anyone. I didn't -- I didn't do a lot of this stuff. And I'm sitting here and I'm taking it, you know, because this -- this is how it goes. But, honestly, I didn't do a lot of these things that I'm saying -- that they saying I did.

I'm accepting responsibility for what I did do.

What I did do is I was involved, period, which was wrong, and
I shouldn't -- and I shouldn't have been involved. I should
have did better, and I made my mistakes. But you -- but I'm
not going to sit -- you know, sit here and just, like, keep
letting it roll when I know I didn't do what they saying I
did.

And I pled out. So now after I plead guilty for -because I was going to lose anyway back at the time, you know,
I was superseded on -- on February 5th. I went to trial.
Well, went for picking a trial on March 18th. I remind you on
March 16th at the suppression hearing, I asked to continue
this for the 30-day thing, for the -- whereas, Contreras case
law, 3161(c)(2), amended act of 1979 about the 30 days or
whatever.

We had an argument back and forth. I studied all my transcripts repeatedly. Like, I know everything that was said in all the -- all the court proceedings that we had.

You ruled in the Government's favor as far as that, didn't grant me a continuance on March 16th, 2016. The trial

was to commence two days later. Still wasn't at my 30-day mark.

I pled out. I was going to lose anyway. Remember I told you when I -- I had Thomas Burke and we had a little quarrel in your courtroom and I asked to dismiss him, because he told me that he did not have a defense for me at that time at all. We was going to lose so I should plead out and he could try and get me back, Rule 35, this, that and the other. He wanted me to take that -- the lesser of the two evils, which I did. I was going to lose anyway.

I had three weeks to prepare for two brand-new witnesses that we didn't even have -- we didn't even know exactly what he was in the beginning. And then don't know what they saying or what I'm being charged with at all when it comes down to these girls. So I'm just saying that to say I just want you to know, you know, I mean, how I feel about it. You know, honestly, like, I'm trying.

I go through a lot in jail or whatever. I mean,

I've been -- I've been change my life. I work real hard at

that, of being a positive person, like, that's my whole thing

right now. I try to help other people and everything. I do

this all the time, like, this is me. I'm a good person. I

mean, I made some mistakes.

That stuff that you saying I did right there that she said I did, I didn't do. And I just want you to know that

in making your decision or -- or whatever. Because the person that you just read off to me in this courtroom, that's embarrassing to me, for my family sitting right here listening to that, and I know I didn't do that. Like, that's embarrassing. I can't -- I can't sit for that.

Like, so I just -- I just felt like I had to say regardless of what sentence you impose today, I just want you to know how I felt about this situation, like, and I'm asking him to object right now, but he wasn't. So I felt like I had to sit up to say something, and I don't like that. I didn't do that and I wouldn't do that, you know what I mean.

What I did do, is I was involved in the prostitution. I was wrong for that, but I'm doing my time and it hurt. I got a 13-year-old daughter, I got a lot going on. I got two sons. I don't even know where one of them is, and the other one was taken by DHS. There's a whole lot going on that derived from this case right here.

When them agents was putting the press on -- when -- when it was pretrial, and they got my DHS involved and they took my son. So now I'm still going through stuff with that. There's a whole lot going on that derived from this case, and these agents and the prosecutor doing what they want to do and saying I -- making this look good for theirselves, and, of course, they make me look bad in the midst of it.

If somebody was doing all that, and that's horrible,

and they should be punished, like, very bad even if it's me, but I ain't ever owned a taser. I never even used a taser in my life. Why would I burn somebody with an iron on your face? I wouldn't do nothing like that. That's not me, and I didn't do that. And I just want you to know that. And I'm sorry. I'm going to shut up, but I was a little bit upset about that.

THE COURT: You can speak whatever you feel that you need to speak. I told you before. I will always give you that respect.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I didn't do that. And I'm still to this day -- and I know I'm here and I supposed to get the points for acceptance and I accept it that what I did was wrong. I'm not going to accept something I didn't do. I didn't do that. I wouldn't do that. And they didn't have a girl that say I did that.

It was being testimony in the Grand Jury. She said you got a burn up on your face. Did Jinx do that? The girl say yes. The girl had bangs. She a white girl with bangs and she was curling her hair. She had bangs in the front of her head. She had a little mark in the front of her face. I seen the picture in the <u>Jencks</u> material at the suppression hearing. She had a mark right here between her eyebrows.

I'm supposed to have burned her hair with a curling iron? That don't make sense. That's not what I do. That same girl was here at the last sentencing. Why didn't she get

up and say it then? Because it didn't happen. It's not true.

She a liar -- she's a liar. You know what I mean, they lie to me -- they came -- they do what they supposed to do. People lie. Everybody not honest all the time. Like, I'm already -- I did what I did. You know what I mean, I'm doing my time. You know what I mean, I'm doing my part, I'm trying to do better.

I'm doing everything I can do, but I am not -- I just don't want to sit here and keep being told I did something that I didn't do and it's all in my transcripts and my family got to sit here and listen to this. This is ridiculous. I'm done. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very well. Now, for your benefit or as a reminder and to those who were not here during the course of the guilty plea in this matter, it is this Court's policy for the last 31 years as a Judge to do what's called a guilty plea colloquy on anybody who pleads guilty -- everybody who pleads guilty. And during the course of that colloquy, I ask a lot of questions including your guilty plea.

At the time of that guilty plea colloquy, I asked not only were you satisfied with the representation your counsel had provided you up to that point in time, but at the conclusion of the Assistant United States Attorney reading to this Court and into the record the facts that they could have proven had this case gone to trial, I said, "Mr. Jackson,

Case 2:13-cr-00622-JDW Document 194 Filed 12/04/20 Page 44 of 70 Sentence of the Court 44 1 you've heard the facts as read by the Assistant United States Attorney. Do you fully admit to those facts?" 2 3 And do you remember your response? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Actually, yes, I do. I read it plenty of times. You asked me, "Do I still wish to plead 5 guilty?" 6 7 You asked me before then, "Was I pleading quilty?" I said, "Yes, I still want to go through with the 8 quilty plea." 9 You said you lose these rights, this right, that 10 right, the right to go to trial. I said, "Yes, I agree, I 11 agree." 12 13 Yeah, she did the stipulation of facts after I said 14 I was pleading quilty. You said, "Okay, hearing that, you 15 still want to plead quilty?" "Yes, I still want to plead guilty." I can't --16 17 THE COURT: And did I ask you why you were pleading guilty? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, you did. 20 THE COURT: And what did you tell me? THE DEFENDANT: You said, why are you pleading 21

quilty, Mr. Jackson? I said, excuse me, give me a second.

You said, go ahead, consult with your attorney. I sat back

and I talked to Tom because Tom the one that told me to plead

guilty that day because he said he had no defense. He told me

22

23

24

25

Sentence of the Court

what to say. He told me how the colloquy would go and he told me what to say. He told me, take a second --

THE COURT: Now, let me just stop you right there. You're speaking awfully fast and I'm giving you full opportunity to do that. But as I said before, I have mine down pat. I know what I ask every defendant including you, and I specifically asked you why you were pleading guilty --

THE DEFENDANT: I said because I am guilty, right.

I asked my -- you told to consult with my attorney -- I got

the transcripts, too. You said take your time, talk to your

-- you seem like you need to talk to your attorney.

I asked him, I said, Tom, I said why am I pleading guilty? He said just tell him because you are guilty. I said, "Because I am guilty."

And that's -- and that's how that went, and I got the transcript. I read it 50 times.

THE COURT: And did I ask you how old you were and how far you went in school and if you were under any kind of duress or coercion to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, you did. I said no.

THE COURT: I asked you all of those questions, not just you, but I ask everybody that, because I am determined as a Judge to be the way that I used to say when I was a Public Defender, and that's fair --

THE DEFENDANT: I think you're a fair Judge.

THE COURT: -- and respectful of everybody who comes here. So I'm saying to you this. I was not there. A jury is not really there in terms of where things happened. They can only go by what is given in sworn testimony in a courtroom. They assess the demeanor of the witnesses. They listen -- they listen to the law, and they go behind that door and they make a decision. They do the best they can with what they have.

You elected to give up that right and to go before this Court and enter a plea of guilty after an extensive colloquy of asking you all kinds of questions to make sure that you knew what you were doing. And I specifically asked you as I ask everyone, "Did anyone tell you what to say today or put words in your mouth?"

And you said, "No."

Now, today you're changing that.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm really not, no. I don't want to be misunderstood. I'm really not trying to -- I'm really not trying to change it because like I say, I -- I still would say I'm guilty of -- of the crime. What I'm saying is, the specifics.

I didn't -- I didn't listen to her colloquy and then want to break down every -- I mean, listen to her statement of facts, what she said that she would have proved -- she said the Government would have proved this. I didn't go into --

Sentence of the Court

oh, well, I didn't do that, but I did that, I didn't do that,

I didn't do that. That wasn't me.

THE COURT: But you could have if you had wanted to.

You could have had a trial if you had wanted to which is the

whole point of a colloquy. And I specifically asked you the

20-some questions --

THE DEFENDANT: Right.

THE COURT: -- "Do you fully understand" --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: -- "that you have a right to 12 people seated -- sitting over there?"

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, you did.

THE COURT: "Do you understand that you have a right to testify, you have a right not to testify? Nobody could force you to testify if you didn't want to."

I told you that, "Even if you have a trial and you chose not to testify that neither I nor the U.S. Attorney could say anything that would allow that jury to infer anything adverse to your interest because you elected not to testify because it's a Constitutional right."

I went also the extra step to tell you on that record that, "If you chose not to testify at the trial, the jury couldn't even infer anything adverse to your interest, and I would give them the law and tell them that they could not do so because it's a Constitutional right that we all

share, the right against self-incrimination."

So my point simply is this. The reason why I asked you all those questions on that date was to find out if you knew what you were doing, if you were pleading guilty because you wanted to and not because anyone forced you to and because you heard what the definitions of the crimes were and you pled guilty because you were guilty of having committed each of those counts and each one of those -- each one of those offenses in each one of those counts.

And everyone goes over that with you in terms of do you plead, how do you plead? And to each one of those you responded guilty. Now, you can't plead guilty to an element of an offense if you didn't do it.

THE DEFENDANT: But, Your Honor, I mean, in my shoes sometime -- I would say I felt like I had to. Like, do you understand? Like, I mean --

THE COURT: But I asked you all those questions, Mr. Jackson, to make sure that I was satisfied that you did not do things that you did not want to do in terms of pleading guilty.

Now, I can't debate this back and forth with you, and I'm trying to be very respectful of what you're saying to me, because listen to me, I'm telling you right now, I would not want to be sitting there myself. Okay? And I'd probably be just saying what you are, okay? Especially having been

there already. It's human nature, and I will treat you like a human being, okay, because there but for the grace of God go any of us, because we could have made a mistake and done something wrong.

But I have a responsibility as a Judge, not just to you and your Constitutional rights, but also to the public and to the victims of this crime.

THE DEFENDANT: Right. Just -- just one last thing

I want to say --

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: -- about that -- about that day. I had to take into consideration the fact that at that time when making this decision, to just, you know, going off with it, and I understood that I was under a life sentence Guidelines. If I lose, which I will, because he told me -- first of all, he did not have a defense for me, like I said, in September on the record. He said we didn't have a defense, we didn't have enough time. That was one.

Two, no one with this case of mine ever won in this Circuit. Like, I was gonna lose, like, you're undefeated. Excuse me, you're undefeated. Excuse me. And -- no one ever won in this Circuit with this case. I had no chance of winning in my opinion. We thought about all that, we talked about it. He said he didn't even have a defense for the last two witnesses. We started the first three witnesses for 21

months, broke everything down. He didn't have a defense. The best thing to do at the time he told me was to plead.

This is my counsel. This is who I was listening to. I took his advice, and I went against my better judgment. And he talked to my mom and my dad that day in court and he told them the same thing about pleading guilty, we didn't have the defense, and it would be better if I did this this way. And I just -- I just kind of trusted him, which I probably shouldn't have at the time, and I should have -- in my opinion, I should have just went.

The whole thing was -- to be honest with you -- the whole thing was to -- to continue was -- being as though I had just got -- been an arraignment on the 27th of February, that month, and we was back in trial, ready to pick a jury on the 18th. The whole thing was to continue was -- and he telling me that we just play for the appeal at this time, you know what I mean, you plead guilty now. He could be -- his terms was very persuasive I believe I said last time when -- when we had the meeting or whatever.

I mean, just -- just to say it like this at the -- at the end of -- I am guilty of some of the things on some of the counts, like I said. But I just didn't force anybody to do anything. I know I gotta be punished, and I live with that, I know I gotta be punished for my crimes and what I did. I was wrong, and I understand that. I'm not trying to justify

it, and, you know, wiggle my way out of it by trying to, you know, talk around the facts. The fact is I was wrong. I should have never been involved. I know better.

I have held employment and I do know how to work, you know --

THE COURT: And I accept that.

THE DEFENDANT: -- so whatever -- whatever I did and made that bad decision because it was easy at the time, that was a flaw. That was -- that was my fault. I shouldn't have did that. That decision changed my whole life. Everything's different now. I'm a different person.

I'm just being straight up with you and I'm telling you some things that I was accused of, I didn't do. Because of what I said on March 18th that year, and I -- and I was trying to say it again at the last sentencing. I just wouldn't force nobody to do anything against they will. That's not the type of person I -- you know, I am or whatever. But I'm guilty of, like, what I said, like, because I was at fault, I was there. You know, I was out there and I did certain things.

But then, you know, other -- other witnesses, like, for example, she said that this witness said this, that and the other. I looked in my <u>Jencks</u> material and I didn't have a statement against me at all from one of these witnesses that I supposed -- allegedly did this and did that. She didn't have

a word against me. So where is all this coming from?

Like, so this is her statement of facts. These are not facts. The witness she saying that I did this to is not saying I did this. It don't make sense. Like, the whole thing -- I got -- I just feel like I just -- at the end, I just feel like -- I know you did your part, you know, that you were supposed to do as a Judge. But overall, I just felt like I got railroaded, like, and I in there for a lot of time, like, you know what I'm saying?

And right now I'm just -- I'm just still -- I'm still in the fight. I'm just still fighting it and just trying to do better. I got -- I got goals, and I'm just working. I'm just working. I don't know what else to say. I'm just working. I'm just doing everything I could do, you know what I mean, to better myself and make sure my family is well, if I can.

But 30 years, it's a long time. My -- my aunt just died. Some other family members died. I lost friends that I thought I probably would never lose. People -- I'm just not close to a lot of people anymore. Everything just turned bad. But this is how it go when you doing time. You know what I mean, so I understand that now. And I -- you know, I made this bed, I lay in it.

All I'm saying is, I ain't do what she said I did in those statement of facts. It was all bogus for the most part.

And, like I said, they got me all -- they don't even -- she don't even got statements to support some of the things that she's saying I did. I don't know where it's coming from, who made up what, but I didn't do it. And I'm sorry for, you know, dragging this on --

THE COURT: That's all right.

THE DEFENDANT: -- a long time, but my life's on the line, right? So --

THE COURT: That's what allocution's about. I'm sorry?

THE DEFENDANT: I said but my life's on the line, right? And every time I talk to you in here, you know, I try to be, you know, straight up for you and open so you can understand how I'm coming.

I been locked up for six years now. A lot of things change in six years, you know, six years I'm a lot more mature. I'm different. I got a 13-year-old daughter. She's a handful herself, you know what I mean. I'm working on her. I would like to be home some time in her life as a young lady so I can guide her to do right, like I said last time, you know.

And I want to be home before my mom die or my grandmom or somebody else that I'm real close to. And I'm just -- I'm just saying all that. I hope you take everything in consideration. I even -- you know, I hope that the victims

Sentence of the Court

in the civil suit thing, you know, for them to get paid, people got paid, they made money, some of the victims and stuff like that.

You know, I'm just doing everything I can do. I don't know what else I can do. They came to me. I didn't have to help. He came to me. He talked to me, he asked me. I just talked to him, like you know what I mean, and tried to help him.

And they didn't have nothing to do with the Government or -- or the law, you know, so I'm not getting any credit or anything for that, you know what I'm saying? I'm just trying to help out people and stuff like that. I'm just trying to be a better person. Ain't much I can do, I'm limited, you know what I'm saying, I'm limited, but I'm trying. And that's just -- that's just pretty much it. I'm trying.

The last time we spoke, you said one of the main -one of the major factors in giving me time -- at that time
like that -- you said there was guns. You said I had those
guns. You don't like those gun charges you told me.

That one gun charge wasn't a gun charge. But they

-- they locked me up on my birthday. I got pulled over. I

was driving my mom's truck. I got pulled over that year on

the high -- ended up in my PSI as a gun charge. I didn't have

no -- I got one gun charge as an adult.

Seven convictions, I really don't remember either.

Like, if I look, I know I went upstate for a gun, 2006. I had theft -- unlawful taking that year. That was the two charges. I came home 2009. I completed the probation and stuff. I had an open case when I first got locked up in 2013 -- oh, yeah, 2009, 2011, I got locked up on my birthday. I had some weed on me.

I had a bag of weed on me -- to SAMS Court

(phonetic) -- never pled guilty for that. That's why I never
got a conviction. I never completed SAMS Court, but I never
went to a trial or anything. So that's why that record looked
like that. So that was -- that was three convictions right
there. Well, that's not even a conviction. That was two
convictions and that SAMS Court thing.

Then after I got locked up in 2013 on this case, I had an open case for the county. I pled out in the county. They say that case wouldn't affect my Sentencing Guidelines no more, because I was going to go to trial on that case, too. They told me that it wouldn't affect my Sentencing Guidelines in the Feds because of the points that I was already at.

Now, today, he proved the thing about the gun in 2011, but behind that, in 2013, now, I got an extra conviction, yeah, I did. Now, if we take off both of those convictions, that would probably take me down another point which would change my Guidelines anyway. But it's all -- it's

all messed up now because it's too late because, you know, they said I had this.

That was wrong in the -- in the information and now I'm saying that I wouldn't probably not have pled, they said if -- but in 2013, I wouldn't have pled to the -- what was the last case?

MR. WILSON: A theft case.

THE DEFENDANT: No, it wasn't a theft case. Oh, yeah, it was a theft, unlawful taking or something like that, it was a theft case. So I pled to the -- I pled to the theft case in -- I think it was '15 or something like that, I pled to a theft case, but all -- I pled to the theft case because they said it wouldn't affect my Sentencing Guidelines when I come -- get sentenced in the Feds.

So now that that changes that, that would automatically probably change my Guidelines. If I had both of those off, would that change my points and make my Sentencing Guidelines lower?

MR. WILSON: No.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I'm just bringing it up because that's what they told me. So I'm done. Thanks.

THE COURT: All right. I only have one question in light of everything you said, and that is did you say that you have -- that there's a gun conviction here that's not correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. The 2011. That's what he just

objected to in the PSI, 2011, November 19th. I was somewhere in the City and I got pulled over. I guess somebody else may have gotten a gun charge in that, so go ahead.

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, that's the 2011 matter that we indicated was a possession of marijuana and not a violation of the Uniform Firearms Act.

THE COURT: All right. So we've made that adjustment then?

MR. WILSON: We made that adjustment.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WILSON: He was then talking about there was an arrest I believe in 2013 that was still open after he was arrested on this matter for a theft. It was also a misdemeanor case. And he -- while he was awaiting sentencing on this case, he pled guilty in that matter. He got a point for that. I think it ended up -- it was a sentence of no extra jail time, but he -- he got a point for that, but it -- he's -- at best, that point took him from eight to nine.

That's still -- that's still within category -- Criminal History Category IV that we've -- that Your Honor's established is the applicable Criminal History Category.

THE DEFENDANT: And even with that, that's still only three convictions as an adult, not seven. That's the ones in 2006 when I was 19 years old and I went upstate, and this Fed charge -- well, that would make four, because there's

1591 in that case right there that I pled to because I was already facing this time over here. And they said it -- it wouldn't affect this sentencing, so I just took a probation charge. I pled guilty to seven years probation instead of taking it to trial.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will now state the sentence it contemplates imposing. However, counsel will have a final opportunity to object prior to the formal imposition of the sentence.

Now, I've heard a lot, I've read a lot. I've not forgotten any of what I've read from the colloquy to the facts as read at the time of the original plea of guilty up through the Presentence Reports, the amended reports, and as I said, the letters here that have been submitted on your behalf from your family members and friends of the family.

I am mindful of one instruction among many in terms of imposing any sentence, and that is the overriding philosophy that a sentence should not be greater than necessary. After all of these years, if my life depended on it, I could not tell you what would be greater or not greater than necessary in terms of a specific period of time of incarceration, and I dare say no Judge knows that. We do the best we can with what we have.

But that is also why there are Sentencing Guidelines to form a range of sentences so that we don't give sentences

that are sort of outside the envelope and outside the norm and they seek some consistency. And having considered those Guidelines and having considered the totality of everything that's been presented here today as well as before, the Court contemplates imposing the following sentence:

As to Count 1, the Court will impose a sentence of 180 months incarceration. As to Counts 2, 3 and 4, the Court will impose a sentence of 180 months incarceration to run concurrently with the other sentences imposed on Count 1, and they will run concurrently, one with the other. And on Count 5, the Court will impose a period of incarceration of 120 months to run consecutively to the sentence imposed on Counts 1 through 4, for a total period of incarceration of 300 months. This Court having considered everything that's been submitted to the Court, I have reduced the original sentence by five years.

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, may we see you at sidebar?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Sidebar discussion as follows:)

MS. MORGAN: 180 mandatory minimum on Count 5.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.

MR. WILSON: So Your Honor could do it -- you could do it as a 300-month sentence on Count 5 to run concurrent with everything.

THE COURT: And that would still give him --

Sentence of the Court MR. WILSON: That would -- 300 months. 1 THE COURT: My apologies. Thank you very much. 2 (Sidebar discussion concluded.) 3 4 THE COURT: Counsel has brought to my attention that the sentence imposed on Count 5 by law has to run 5 consecutively, so, therefore, I'm going to modify Count 5's 6 7 sentence --MR. WILSON: Your Honor, simply, it just has to be 8 180 months. It can run concurrently. 9 THE COURT: All right. Fine. 10 11 So the sentence on Count 5 will be 300 months, but it will run concurrently with the sentence imposed on Counts 12 13 1, 2, 3 and 4 for a total of 300 months. And as I said, it is 14 now reduced by five years. The Court will recommend to the Federal Bureau of 15 Prisons that the defendant be incarcerated at State 16 17 Correctional Institution at Fairton as he has requested to 18 accommodate the family to be able to come and visit him. 19 Upon release, the defendant shall be placed on 20 supervised release for a term of five years. This term consists on five years on each of Counts 1 through 5, all such 21

terms to run concurrently, one with the other. Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the

Probation Office in the district to which the defendant is

22

23

24

25

1 released.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another Federal, State or local crime, shall be prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous device.

Now, I always pause -- because I tell you I'm -- I do a lot of things by habit and custom, and it's my custom and habit to always pause here on this portion of me telling a defendant about what the defendant can never, ever do again.

I emphasize that you cannot touch a gun for the rest of your life. Do you understand me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The defendant shall likewise not possess an illegal controlled substance and shall comply with the other standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court. The defendant must submit to one drug test 15 days of commencement of supervised release, and I recognize that we're talking about a long, long time from now. If at that time in the future, there's no need, then that won't happen, that won't be necessary. But that's going to depend upon you and your conduct while incarcerated.

The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the Probation Officer. The defendant, based upon what I have heard in this record, shall participate in a drug and alcohol treatment evaluation and program if

1 necessary.

The defendant shall report to the United States

Probation Office any regular contact with children of either sex under the age of 18 assuming Megan's Law doesn't prohibit it altogether in the first place. The defendant shall not obtain employment or perform volunteer work which includes regular contact with children under the age of 18.

The defendant shall register with the State Sex

Offender Registration Agency in any State where the defendant resides, is employed, carries on a vocation or is a student as directed by the probation officer.

The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine; therefore, I will not impose a fine in this case. However, it will be ordered that the defendant pay to the United States a total special assessment of \$500, which shall be due immediately.

Is there an objection to the Court's sentence as contemplated by either counsel?

MS. MORGAN: Your Honor, I just want to clarify for the record that the Court is granting the defendant's motion for a downward variance?

THE COURT: Yes. Yes.

MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, I guess I'm required to

reiterate all the arguments I've made and -- but, otherwise, I 1 don't have anything else to say. 2 THE COURT: All right. The record shall so reflect. 3 4 Mr. Jackson, please rise. MR. WILSON: Your Honor, can I have one moment? 5 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 6 7 Mr. Jerel Jackson, you've heard the sentence the Court stated as contemplated. That sentence is hereby 8 formally imposed. Do you recall with specificity what I've 9 stated in the sentence on each count? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Supervised release period? 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 14 THE COURT: No fine, but the cost of Court. Do you 15 understand that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Right. 17 THE COURT: And, sir, you have a right to appeal 18 this sentence. If you choose to do so, it must be done within 14 days of the entry of the judgment. If you cannot afford 19 20 counsel to assist you in that appeal, counsel will be appointed to represent you. Do you understand that? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: And if you cannot afford to process the 23 24 appeal, all you need to do is file what's called an in forma

pauperis petition which indicates that you cannot afford the

25

Sentence of the Court

paperwork basically and the fees and that will be done by the Clerk of Court on your behalf. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I reduced the sentence because of all the people who were here to support you, and I will accept your representation that you are a changed human being by reason of the trauma that you've gone through and the trauma that I expect you and you expect to go through for the next extended number of years.

There is always the possibility of redemption, but you've dug such a deep hole for yourself that you've tied my hands as a Judge to give you any less time of incarceration, because regardless of whether you contest it now, at the time when you had an opportunity to do so, you entered a plea of guilty to these offenses, and I'm duty bound by the law to do what I have to do.

It's never too late in your life to do the right thing. I trust you'll turn it around.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: To those of you who've come in his support, I appreciate that you were here. It is not the end of the world. One of these days he will be released and whether it's five years earlier than I had said before or later, depending upon his good conduct, he's going to need you and need your support, and I trust you'll be there for him

then to keep him out of trouble or help him stay out of trouble. In the end, the decision's up to him.

I would as an aside recommend to you, and I happen to see this just myself the other night, a presentation on incarcerated individuals. I don't know if any of you saw that. You saw that?

Well, for the rest -- well, you should share it with the rest of them to see and hear some men in Angola,

Louisiana, one of the worst prisons historically in the country, talk about their sentences, who they are now and what they were before and how much longer they have to stay, some for the rest of their lives.

I don't know that you'll ever be able to see that, but if you ever get a chance to, Mr. Jackson, you might want to see that, too. Because they're men who are -- some of them are like 70 and 80 years of age who will still never get out of prison. So in some respects, you can consider yourself very fortunate.

Anything further?

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, there was one other matter. I know Your Honor's making a recommendation to Fairton. My client -- and this was addressed the last time we convened, but there really wasn't much of a hearing at that time, but there was discussion about his getting surgery and is being on the list for surgery.

1 And I know that Your Honor's had the advantage of speaking to somebody over at the Federal Detention Center, 2 that I don't have that advantage. But he is under the 3 4 impression that his surgery is on hold now because it was supposed to be at Hahnemann, and he's wondering if there can 5 be some deferral of the implementation of his sentence to 6 7 still try and get the surgery done while he's here at the FDC. And I don't know whether Your Honor would consider deferring 8 9 the imposition of the sentence at this point or not. Obviously, the sentence -- it wouldn't change the sentence, 10 but if Your Honor would consider deferring it for 11 approximately 60 days to see if he can get the surgery, I 12 13 don't know. And -- and I know Your Honor has talked to the Legal Department specifically as to what they're doing with 14 15 respect to any surgery. THE COURT: And the Court has no control over that 16 17 -- none. That is between the Bureau of Prisons and 18 physicians. And the understanding that I have is that once he 19 is transferred, they will address it at that time with a 20 physician and it will go from there, but I don't have any ability or authority over that. 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. THE COURT: Anything further? 23

THE DEFENDANT: I want to ask about the recommendation to Fairton.

24

25

Sentence of the Court 1 THE COURT: Yes, sir. THE DEFENDANT: Currently I'm in USP McCreary at 2 Kentucky. 3 4 THE COURT: Yes, sir. THE DEFENDANT: I'm supposed to come down from the 5 USP two months before I came on RIC so I'm assuming as soon as 6 7 I go back up there, I probably be there for a few months, then drop down to medium custody. Then I'll be able to go to 8 Fairton because I gotta be medium or I gotta have a managed 9 variable to go to Fairton. 10 11 THE COURT: Again, that's something that's run by the Bureau of Prisons and the Trial Judge has absolutely no 12 13 authority in that regard whatsoever. 14 THE DEFENDANT: So even though it's recommended, is 15 it -- it's not for sure that --THE COURT: That's right. I can recommend as I've 16 17 recommended a lot of places for people to be held and serve 18 their sentence, frankly, because they were physically proximate to Philadelphia so people could go and visit them. 19 20 Their relatives could go and visit them. But in the end, if the Bureau of Prisons says, no, 21 22

we can't accommodate that request, Judge, there's nothing the Judge can do. I can't order that.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

23

24

25

THE COURT: I can just make a recommendation.

1 THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: As long as I'm recommending, I recommend that over the next years, you do what one of the other defendants I had do, and that is, put some of that money aside for your children if you care as much about them as you say you do -- and let them -- and mail them a check. Put it on the -- on the voucher so that the mothers can come and get that money and support your child. You have a daughter, right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, right.

THE COURT: How old is she?

THE DEFENDANT: 13.

THE COURT: Well, if you believe in her and you want her to be raised the way you say you should and you want her to be, then help pay for her.

THE DEFENDANT: Right. Well, the only problem with that is, I'm going to bill myself. I don't have no income.

All my income come from the outside. So I can't make money.

I mean, I can make money in here. I mean, I can get a job.

THE COURT: Well, that's what that guy did, that I had this past week. He worked in prison.

THE DEFENDANT: That's cool, but, I mean, I'm with that, like, you know, we should support the family, all of us.

THE COURT: We're talking a 25-year sentence here.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

Case 2:13-cr-00622-JDW Document 194 Filed 12/04/20 Page 69 of 70 69 Sentence of the Court 1 THE COURT: You have plenty of time to make some money and send it to your child -- children --2 3 THE DEFENDANT: Right. 4 THE COURT: -- simple as that. 5 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. THE COURT: All right. You've got to man up. 6 7 you very much. Yes, ma'am? MS. DeVAUGHN: I know this is a little far-fetched, 8 but I -- I still want to ask you. I haven't seen my son since 9 May 11th. I just want to know can I hug him before he goes 10 back, Your Honor? 11 12 THE COURT: I have absolutely no authority to do 13 that. 14 MS. DeVAUGHN: Okay. THE COURT: That's the United States Marshal's 15 16 Service. 17 MS. DeVAUGHN: Okay. 18 THE COURT: I'm sorry, but I just don't have the 19 authority. 20

MS. DeVAUGHN: Okay.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. We're adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 4:51 p.m.)

24

25

21

22

23

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	
4	
5	I, Lois A. Vitarelli, court approved transcriber,
6	certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
7	official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the
8	above-entitled matter.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	/s/Lois Vitarelli November 24, 2020
14	LOIS A. VITARELLI
15	DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING, LLC
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	